



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,719	01/30/2001	Timothy W. Rawlings	8846.00	9476

7590 06/18/2002

Douglas S. Foote
NCR Corporation
101 West Schantz, ECD-2
Dayton, OH 45479-0001

EXAMINER

AHMAD, NASSER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1772

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2002

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MFE3

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/771,719	Applicant(s) Rawlings et al.
Examiner Nasser Ahmad	Art Unit 1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) 11-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 2

6) Other: _____

1. Restrictions to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 :
 - I. Claims 1-10, drawn to a label sheet, classified in class 428, subclass 40.1.
 - II. Claims 11-16, drawn to a method for duplex printing a label sheet, classified in class 156, subclass 277.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:
3. Inventions II and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process such as printing on one side only or printing by hand.
4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
5. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Richard Traverso, Registration #30595 on May 6, 2002 a provisional election was made ~~wit~~^h traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-10. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 11-16 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

The declaration includes the incomplete name of the fourth inventor whose name appears as "Mitch" but should be "Mitchell" as shown in page 2/3 of declaration.

7. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms, which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: The specification, page 6, refers to figure 3 (see line 3) but there is no figure 3 in the originally filed application. Also, some of the numerals labeling the figures are not explained in the specifications.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, as stated, is found to be indefinite and confusing as to the "two printable sides" phrase. It is not clear if the sheet has two opposing major surfaces as the two printable sides or does the phrases refer to two areas on the same surface of the sheet.

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

11. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

12. Claims 1-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fox (6,254,952).

Fox relates to a label sheet comprising a face sheet, an adhesive layer bonded to the face sheet and a release liner removable adhered to the liner (see figure-3). The sheet has two printable sides and has at least one removable adhered label defining an area on the sheet surface. The label is tied to another area of the same surface of the sheet using a tie (abstract and figure 5, numerals 38 and 44). If the label is taken to be numeral 40 in figure 5, then said label would have at least one tie on the leading edge and at least one tie on the trailing edge. The edges are defined by the direction of travel of the label sheet. Also, figure 5 shows that the respective plurality of ties is evenly spaced. The label is defined by die cut around the perimeter and the ties are located in the portions around the perimeter that has not been die cut. The label sheet

comprises multiple labels provided with at least one tie to one another. The adhesive composition would exhibit softening at temperatures during printing because it uses similar printers from the same manufacturers.

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox.

Fox, as discussed above, fails to teach that the face sheet comprises two face sheets and two adhesive layers, one each on each side of the release liner. It would have been obvious matter of design choice to modify Fox by providing, on the second surface of the release liner. The second face sheet adhered by the second adhesive thereby decreasing waste. Such a modification would involve mere obvious duplication of parts.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nasser Ahmad whose telephone number is (703) 308-4424. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (703) 308-4251. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 1772

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 305-7115 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Nasser Ahmad
NASSER AHMAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

N. Ahmad/dh
June 13, 2002